

Appln. No. 09/848,742

Attorney Docket No. 8627-189

## II. Remarks

On June 18, 2004, the Applicants filed a Reply to a Non-Final Office Action (mailed March 18, 2004). On August 6, 2004, the Office mailed a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, stating that a complete listing of all of the claims was not present in the June 18<sup>th</sup> Reply. By this Paper, the Applicants submit a complete listing of all the claims including missing claims 39-79 (now cancelled). Additionally, the June 18<sup>th</sup> Reply to the Office Action now complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 as required. Furthermore, the original language of the Remarks in the June 18<sup>th</sup> Reply is provided below for the Examiner's convenience.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the case interview conducted on June 18, 2004. During the interview, it was agreed that the rejection of dependent claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Kaldany* (USPN 5,222,949) and *Zamore* (USPN 6,596,818) appeared to have not have been directed to claim 20, but rather to dependent claims 32 (amended) and 33 (cancelled). It was also agreed that Applicants will rewrite claim 20 in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and Examiner will then review *Zamore* in light thereof. Upon finding no teaching in *Zamore* of the limitations in the rewritten claim, the Examiner will allow the rewritten claim.

Claims 1-38 are currently pending in the present application. Applicants affirm the withdrawal of claims 2, 3, 5-7, 10-13, 16-18, 26-27, and 36-38 from further consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicants cancel claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-20, 26-28, 33-34, and 36-38. Moreover, claims 80-82 have been added. Claims 4, 21-25, 29, 32, and 35 have been amended. With the claims listed above and the remarks provided below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and a withdrawal of all rejections and objections.

Responsive to the objections of claims 28 and 34 (now cancelled), claims 28 and 34 have been rewritten in independent form as claims 80 and 81, respectively, including all of the limitations of claim 1 (now cancelled) and any intervening claims

BRINKS  
HOFFER  
GILSON  
& LIONE

-8-

Appln. No. 09/848,742

Attorney Docket No. 8627-189

as indicated by the Examiner on page 5 of the Office action. Thus, independent claims 80 and 81 are allowable.

As mentioned above, Applicants have rewritten claim 20 in independent form as new independent claim 82. New claim 82 includes all of the limitations of claim 20, all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 1), and any intervening claim (claim 19).

Responsive to the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaldany* and *Zamore*, the combination of *Kaldany* and *Zamore* does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 82 (claim 20 rewritten in independent form). For example, claim 82 recites that:

the cross-linking reactant is selected from the group consisting of:

(a) a difunctional material selected from the class consisting of diallyl adipate; diallyl carbonate; diallyl maleate; diallyl succinate; diallyl tetrabromophthalate; diethyl diallylmalonate; dimethyl diallylmalonate; and 2,2,6,6 tetra-bromobisphenol A diallyl ether;

(b) a trifunctional material selected from the class consisting of 2, 5-diallyl-4, 5-dimethyl-2-cyclopenten-1-one; diallyl fumarate; diallyl itaconate; 1, 3, 5-triallyl-2 methoxybenzene; triallyl trimesate (triallyl 1, 3, 5-benzenetricarboxylate); triallyl trimellitate (triallyl 1, 2, 4-benzenetricarboxylate); and pentaerythritol triallyl ether;

(c) a tetrafunctional material selected from the class consisting of tetraallyl cis,cis,cis,cis-cyclopentane-1,2,3,4-tetracarboxylate; and N,N,N',N'-tetraallylethylenediamine; and

(d) an aromatic molecule containing at least two ring substituents, each of the ring substituents having labile hydrogens at a benzylic site therein,

wherein the unitarily and continuously formed portion (108) comprises at least first and second parts (102 and 104) unitarily and continuously formed with one another, at least one of the first and second parts (102 or 104) being exposed to cross-linking irradiation.

The combination does not teach or suggest the cross-linking reactant as recited above. In fact, the Office action on page 4 refers to reactants "triallyl isocyanurate" and "meta-phenylene dimaleimide," which are recited only in dependent claims 32 (amended) and 33 (cancelled), respectively. As mentioned above, the rejection

BRINKS  
HOFFER  
GILSON  
SLONE

Appln. No. 09/848,742

Attorney Docket No. 8627-189

appears not to have been directed to claim 20. The combination clearly does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 82. Additionally, there is no motivation to combine *Kaldany* and *Zamore*. Thus, claim 82 is allowable.

Responsive to the rejections of claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kaldany* and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Cecchi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,165.), claim 4 has been amended to depend from independent claim 82. Moreover, claim 8 is dependent on claim 4. Thus, claims 4 and 8 are allowable for the reasons provided above.

Responsive to the rejections of claims 19-25, 29-33, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaldany* in view of *Zamore* (U.S.P.N. 6,596,818), claims 21-25, 29-32, and 35 are dependent on claims which depend generally from claim 82. Thus, claims 21-25, 29-32, and 35 are allowable for the reasons provided above.

As for claims 19-20 and 33, claims 19-20 and 33 have been cancelled. Thus, no further discussion is necessary for claims 19-20 and 33.

Responsive to the rejections of claims 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, claim 22 has been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. For example, claim 22 no longer recites "or" in the body and has been amended to recite that "the mixture comprises one of the following ranges."

As for claim 20, claim 20 has been cancelled. Thus, no further discussion is necessary for claim 20.

Responsive to the rejections of claim 1, 9, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kaldany* (USPN 5,222,949) and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Cecchi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,165.), claims 1, 9, and 14-15 have been cancelled. Thus no further discussion is necessary for claims 1, 9, and 14-15.

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
BLONE

-10-


Appln. No. 09/848,742

Attorney Docket No. 8627-189

Therefore, claims 4, 8, 21-25, 29-32, 35, and 80-82 are in a condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

September 7, 2004  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lawrence G. Almeda (Reg. No. 46,151)

BRINKS  
HOFFER  
GILSON  
& LIONE

-11-